

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **August 4, 2004**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-36. Claims 1-12 and 25-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 13-24 were allowed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-12 and 25-36 were rejected because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 25 to clarify that the present invention (1) **stores the interval representation** in the computer system memory, and after performing the Newton technique on the interval representation, also (2) **records the interval representation** of the result in system memory. Thus, the presentation performs a physical transformation by altering the state of the system memory. Claims 13-24 were previously allowed.


Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 13, and 25 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-12, which depend upon claim 1, claims 14-24, which depend upon claim 13, and claims 26-35, which depend upon claim 25, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Edward J. Grundler

Registration No. 47,615

Date: October 7, 2004

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665